



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,793	03/03/2004	Helena Corneliussen	018798-214	4388
21839	7590	11/26/2007		
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			EXAMINER REICHLE, KARIN M	
			ART UNIT 3761	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/26/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com  
debra.hawkins@bipc.com

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/790,793

Applicant(s)

CORNELIUSSON, HELENA

Examiner

Karin M. Reichle

Art Unit

3761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2006 and 06 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 3/04 and 12/06 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Priority*

1. The translation of the provisional application filed in Swedish has been placed in the application.

### *Specification*

### *Drawings*

2. The drawings were received on 12-21-06. These drawings are not approved. See following paragraph, i.e. not only did the 12-21-06 drawings not overcome the previously presented objections, but also raised new objections.

3. The drawings are objected to because Figure 4 and the description thereof in paragraph 12 appear to be inconsistent, i.e. the Figures are missing layers (Note discussion *infra*). In Figure 1, the line from 4 should be dashed to denote underlying structure. This also applies to the lines from 10, 11, 10b, 11b, 14-15, 14b-15b, 17 and 20. These last objections also apply to similar denotations in Figures 2 and 3. Additionally it also applies to the line from 21 in Figure

2. The attachment lines and interior borders as now claimed in claim 14 should be clearly denoted. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure

Art Unit: 3761

must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the Z-shape of the barrier in combination with the upper cover as well as the barrier being separate from the upper and lower cover sheets as claimed in claims 1-15 and the elastic member having attachment points as claimed in claim 6, see also discussion *infra*, must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the

Art Unit: 3761

renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Description*

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Throughout the textual description, and Figures Applicant still recites the side barriers as folded in a Z shape. However as best seen in Figure 4, the barriers are shown folded in a C shape or V shape opened outwardly with a single fold facing inwards not a Z shape with two folds one of which faces outwardly and one of which faces inwardly. Note also claims 1 and 15 as amended 9-6-07. Therefore, a clear consistent textual and pictorial description should be set forth throughout the application. Note again the Examiner's comments in the 8-13-07 communication with regard to such and note again Applicant's remarks at page 12, lines 9-10 of the 12-26-06 response, i.e. the topsheet and barriers define a Z-shape, i.e. not the side barriers only. Similarly, claim 6 as now amended and new claim 15 recite the attachment points extend outside and overlap rear attachment points of the elastic whereas the textual description and Figures disclose an elastic member which extends outside and overlaps rear portions of the elastic but has attachment points outside the rear attachment points, see paragraphs 20 and 23-24, i.e. not consistent with the claims. A clear consistent description of the rear barrier attachment points should be set forth. Finally clear antecedent basis for the claim terminology "an attachment line" and "the interior

Art Unit: 3761

border” as now set forth in new claim 14 should be set forth (Note paragraph 22 and MPEP 608.01(o), i.e. use of a confusing number of terms to describe the same structure should be avoided.)

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 now requires each side barrier is a separate component from the upper and lower cover sheets yet the remainder of claim 1 and, e.g., claim 2 sets forth the combination of such, i.e. secured to one another, not separate. A clear consistent description of the barriers with respect to the sheets should be set forth, e.g. barriers which are combined with but not monolithically formed with the sheets could be set forth.

### ***Claim Language Interpretation***

7. Due to the lack of clarity set forth supra, a fold which is Z-shaped as claimed or a sideways V shape as shown will be deemed to meet the claims. Similarly attachment points of the rear barrier which at least extend outside the elastic elements of the side barriers will be deemed to meet the claims. Due to the lack of clarity set forth supra, a barrier which has a least a portion thereof not monolithically formed with the upper and lower cover sheets will be deemed to meet the claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

9. Claims 1-3, 11-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al JP '607.

Claims 1-3 and 11-12: See Figures 2-5 and Figures 7-8 (the last two Figures show alternative embodiments at the same cross -section as that of Figure 4, and the English abstract of '607, i.e. '607 teaches an absorbent article defining a longitudinal direction, a front portion adjacent 4b in the longitudinal direction, a rear portion adjacent 6, and a middle portion along III-III arranged between said portions and having an upper, liquid-permeable cover sheet 1, a lower, liquid-impermeable cover sheet 2, an absorption body 3 arranged between the cover sheets, and first and second side barriers 4 along respective longitudinal sides, each side barrier in turn comprising at least one longitudinal elastic element 5, the first and second side barriers, viewed from above, defining a shape which narrows in the direction towards said front portion so that the distance, in the transverse direction of the article, between the elastic elements, is greater in said rear portion than in said front portion, see Figure 2, and each side barrier is arranged such that, when it is secured in contact with the front portion, see Figure 5, it defines a folded structure of substantially the same shaped cross section as shown in Figure 4 of the instant application, see Figure 5 again, or a Z-shape, i.e. in combination with the upper cover sheet, see Figures 2-3 and 5 (Note the shape in the front portion also lies between lines III and IV) and Figures 7-8, with a fold adjacent 10 or 12 directed towards the inside of said article. The side barriers are secured to the cover sheet so that respective first and second longitudinal folds are

defined, see Figures 3-5 adjacent 9 or 10 and 11 and Figures 7-8 adjacent 12. The elastic element in the side barriers, viewed from above, are secured to the rear portion outside their respective folds, see Figure 4 between 10 and 11 and similar locations in Figures 7-8. The elastic elements run at least partially in contact with their respective folds, see element 5 in Figure 5, with respect to the fold adjacent 10 and see element 5 in Figure 4 adjacent the fold adjacent 11. Finally the first and second side barriers by themselves constitute a combined side leakage protection and leg elastic for the article.

Claim 1 now also requires each side barrier is a separate component from the upper and lower cover sheets. See Claim Language Interpretation section *supra*, i.e. at least the elastic element of each barrier is not monolithically formed with the cover sheets in Figures 3-5 and also see Figures 7 and 8, especially Figure 7, which show other portions of the barrier including the entire barrier being not monolithically formed with the cover sheets.

Claim 14: See Figures 4 and 7-8 adjacent 12. It is noted that the claim does not require the attachment line define the interiormost point of an interior border of the side barrier.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

11. Claims 4-7, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki '607 in view of Robertson '364 and Olsson '732.

Claims 4-6 further require a rear barrier formed in said rear portion, which rear barrier is intended for taking up bodily excretions in the direction rearwards along the article, and includes



Art Unit: 3761

a further elastic element having attachment points which, viewed from above, at least extend outside, as best understood, rear attachment points of the elastic elements in the side barriers such that a barrier is defined along both the longitudinal sides and rear side of the article. While Suzuki '607 does not teach such a rear barrier, it does teach side barriers, i.e. suggests the desire for barriers/leakage prevention. However, see Robertson '364 at the Figures and col. 3, lines 9-33, the paragraph bridging cols. 4-5, col. 12, line 23-col. 13, line 50, e.g. elastic film of laminate is an elastic element, and col. 17, line 45-col. 18, line 8 and Olsson et al '732 at the Figures, especially 1 and 9, col. 11, lines 63-66 and the abstract which teach a rear barrier formed in said rear portion for taking up bodily excretions in the direction rearwards and includes an elastic element having attachment points which, viewed from above, at least extend outside, i.e. '364 also teaches overlapping rear portions, rear attachment points of elastic elements in the side barriers such that a barrier is defined along both the longitudinal sides and rear side of the article. Therefore to employ a rear barrier such as, for example, taught by '364 and '732, i.e. the claimed structure as best understood, on the '607 device would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art in view of the recognition that such a feature in combination with side barriers improves the ability of the article to prevent leakage and the desire suggested by '607.

Claims 7 and 13 require each side barrier including two elastic elements one extending outside the other as viewed in relation to a longitudinal axis of symmetry through the article and the elastic elements consisting of elastic threads. While '607 does not show such, it does show a single elastic strip. Furthermore, for example, '364 at col. 11, lines 41-62 and '732 at col. 7, lines 42-45 teach the interchangeability of parallel elastic threads for a strip or film. Therefore to make the elastic strip of each side barrier of '607 two elastic threads instead would

Art Unit: 3761

be obvious in view of the interchangeability as taught by '364 and '732. In so doing the prior art teaches the structure of claims 7 and 13.

Claim 15: See the discussion of claims 1 and 4-6 supra.

12. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki '607 in view of Sageser et al '428.

Claims 8-10 require the distance between the elastic elements of the side barriers is at least two times greater at the said rear portion than at the front portion or the distance between the elastic elements of the side barriers is at least three times greater at the rear portion than at the front portion or the distance between parts of the elastic elements the side barriers nearest to the inside of the article or is within the range of 1 - 3 cm at said front portion, respectively. Note paragraphs 33-34 of the instant application. While the claimed distance as seen in Figures 3 and 5 is approximately two times greater and there is a space at the front portion the '607 reference does not explicitly teach the claimed distances. Also note again Suzuki '607 does teach side barriers, i.e. suggests the desire for barriers/leakage prevention. However, see '428 at col. 7, lines 18-42 and col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 50, i.e. spacing apart of the edges, i.e. elastics, of inwardly folded front portions of side barriers a distance of -2.5 cm to 15 cm combined with outwardly folded or flipped out rear portions of side barriers provides a better fit to the contours of the wearers body which reduces leakage (Note that if the front edges as shown in Figure 1 were spaced about next to each other, i.e. 0 cm, the spacing in the rear would clearly be at least 3 times that in the front, as shown the spacing in the rear is about 2-3 times the spacing in the front.). Therefore, to employ the spacing as taught by Sageser '428, i.e. as claimed, on the '607 device, if not already, would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the

recognition that such would provide improved fit with the body resulting leakage prevention and the desire suggested by '607.

### *Response to Arguments*

13. Applicant's remarks have been carefully considered but are either deemed moot in that they have not been repeated or are deemed not persuasive for the reasons set forth supra, e.g. because such are narrower than the claim language and/or the teachings of the prior art and/or the amendments made to the specification. For example, Suzuki does teach a side barrier which is not monolithically formed with the cover sheets as best understood, attention is again invited to Figures 7-8 thereof. With regard to claim 6 and 15, as best understood, see not only the prior art rejection supra but also, e.g., '364 at col. 14, lines 11-12 and col. 16, lines 13-32

### *Conclusion*

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 3761


however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any new grounds of rejection were necessitated by the amendments to the specification and claims and new claims 14-15.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karin M. Reichle whose telephone number is (571) 272-4936. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tanya Zalukaeva can be reached on (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Karin M. Reichle  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3761

KMR  
November 15, 2007